

Summary of Public Comments and DNR Responses to Draft Michigan SFMP  
Recreational Comments

05/27/2008

Organization	Comment	Plan Section	DNR Repsonse
Michigan Mountain Biking Assoc	Biking is a low-impact, nonmotorized activity practiced and enjoyed on many primitive trails in Michigan State Forests. Thus, I am requesting it be added to the following section on Desired Future Condition: "Recreational trails will include a variety of looped and linear trails that are connected with recreation resources such as campground trailheads, and will range in accessibility from wheel chair accessible to primitive hiking AND BIKING trails."	4.1.1.2	This sentence pertains to the range of accessibility only. Mountain biking is listed as a trail type that the State Forest provides opportunities for in the previous sentence. Therefore, biking is already listed as a trail type that that we would consider for the state forest.
Michigan Mountain Biking Assoc	The second change I am requesting pertains to including biking as a primary recreational use of Dedicated Management Areas in Michigan State Forests. Studies have shown biking to be a low-impact, minimally invasive and nonintrusive nonmotorized recreational activity with ecological impact parallel to that of hiking. For these reasons, I request it be added to the following section: "The primary uses of these areas include dispersed, nonintrusive recreation, such as hunting, trapping, wildlife viewing, hiking, BIKING, cross country skiing, and snowshoeing."	5.2.6	The primary uses allowed in Dedicated Management Areas are pedestrian related and not wheeled uses. However, biking may be allowed in a few of these areas. Users should contact the local Department land manager to verify if Mt. biking is allowed in that specific area.
MDNR	Page 68. End of para 2 - What about the Midland to Mackinac Riding and Hiking Trail? Beginning of Para 4 - There are five types of trails provided by the ORV Trail program. Need to add the MCCCT. Middle of Para 4 - In the LP, what about the county road ROW's for which some counties and townships have adopted ordinances to allow ORV's to ride on county road ROWs?	3.5.3	1) Midland to Mackinac is not a state maintained trail. 2)The MCCCT is a motorcycle trail and would fall under the motorcycle trail type, 3) At this time county road ROW are not part of the designated system unless they are part of a designated route or trail.
MDNR	Page 109. Is the Section 4.1.1.1 title meant to include PRD sites which are not on the State Forest? If so, a clarification statement may be needed.	4.1.1.1	No, this title is not meant to include PRD sites and the title should be changed to remove " <u>and Marinas/Harbors</u> "

Summary of Public Comments and DNR Responses to Draft Michigan SFMP  
Recreational Comments

05/27/2008

MDNR	Page 113, Goal 2 - Suggest rewording to "except within one mile of a <u>designated</u> state forest campground".	4.1.1.3	The dispersed camping registration card states state forest campground, not designated state forest campground. To be consistent we will not be adding "designated" to the sentence.
None	Please continue to promote and create Motorcycle only trails. Single track trails eventually evolve to wider trails, suitable to a wider variety of ORV vehicles anyway and are how most trails in Michigan began. It makes economic sense to start with narrow, motorcycle only trails. If you promote wider, more all purpose trails, you might as well designate all two tracks and gravel roads, as ORV Trail.	4.1.1.2	The Department supports this position and, in fact, we are in the process of getting a Land Use Order of the Director approved that will allow us to enforce motorcycle only trail designations.
City of Cadillac	Section 3.5.3 of the draft plan addresses Forest Recreation and Tourism. Generally, much of the information conveyed and observations provided are based on data from reports compiled in the year 2000, and in certain instances earlier. Given the fact that tourism is so vital to Michigan's economy, I find it disappointing that this section is based largely on antiquated information.	3.5.3	The Department was in the process of initiating an economic study on motorized recreation in 2007 when the State's budget crisis delayed implementing the study. The Department agrees that tourism is vital to this State's economy and will be moving forward with such studies as funding allows.
None	I am quite concerned with the limitations that are being put upon the horse back riders. I am afraid that if this continues to be restricted across the state as much as it is being done in the Pigeon River Country the children of today will never get to experience that wonderful feeling of being out in the forest with only your friends and your horse. Seeing the elk, deer, and other wonderful wildlife adventures on horseback is a "high" to us as much as it is to the hunter who sees the elk, large bucks, and turkeys. Please I beg of you not to let the strict proposals pass and take yet another privilege away from the citizens of this beautiful state.	4.1.1.2	The SFMP contains contains a desired future condition in Section 4.1.1.2 for providing a variety of recreation trails (including horseback) in the State Forest. Section 4.1.1.3 also provides for dispersed camping opportunities. Specific comment related to the Concept of Management for the Pigeon River County State Forest is not specific to the SFMP.

Summary of Public Comments and DNR Responses to Draft Michigan SFMP  
Recreational Comments

05/27/2008

None	My comments are regarding section "4.1.1.2 Recreational Trails" of the management plan. Under Objective #10 Prepare and conduct timber harvest prescriptions in a manner that attempts to minimize obstructions and maintain aesthetic values along trails. "to minimize obstructions" was added. If the meaning of this is to harvest trees so they don't fall down on the trail and cause an obstruction it should be removed. It provides justification for any and all timber removal along a trail. This directly contradicts the objective of maintaining aesthetic values.	4.1.1.2	The intent of the objective is to maintain aesthetic values along trails. The phrase "to minimize obstructions" simply means to not obstruct trails during harvest operations. A standard was added to Section 4.1.1.2 for visual management.
None	Although Objective #1 under 4.1.1.6 Visual Management is "seeks to establish, maintain or enhance vegetated buffer zones around campgrounds, access sites, and trails systems." A specific objective under 4.1.1.2 Recreational Trails should be added that seeks to maintain and establish a buffer zone from timber harvesting along the trail. The Management plan should acknowledge and reflect the fact that timber harvests along recreational trails have a direct negative impact for rail users. Instead of only trying to mitigate that impact of timber harvests the management plan should promote large buffer areas along trail systems where timber harvesting is not allowed.	4.1.1.2	A standard was added to Section 4.1.1.2 for visual management.